

~~TOP SECRET~~



PUBLIC AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
1400 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-1400

8 DEC 1994  
94-F-0532



Director  
Records Declassification Div (NND)  
Room 6350  
The National Archives at College Park  
8601 Adelphi Road  
College Park, MD 20740-6001


Dear Ms. Schauble:

This is in response to your February 3, 1994, letter which forwarded the enclosed documents for declassification review. Your Project Number NND 941103 refers.

We have been advised by the appropriate Component of the Office of the Secretary of Defense that they have no objection to declassification and release of the documents with the exception of the information bracketed in red on pages NND 941103-97 to 99, and 188 to 190. That information is currently and properly classified in accordance with Executive Order 12356, Section 1.3(a)(1). Consequently, the information in red brackets should be denied pursuant to Title 5 USC 552(b)(1). The Initial Denial Authority is Mr. Edmund F. McBride, Chief, Information Management Division, Joint Staff. It is further recommended that document 3, 4 and 43 also be reviewed by the Central Intelligence Agency prior to release.

The requester may appeal the denial of Mr. McBride within 60 days of your response to him by offering justification to support reversal of the decision. The appeal should be addressed to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), DFOISR, Room 2C757, Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1400.

Sincerely,

  
H. J. McIntyre  
Acting Deputy Director  
Directorate for Freedom of  
Information and Security Review

Enclosures:  
As stated

~~TOP SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED  
FROM CLASSIFIED ENCLOSURE



~~TOP SECRET~~  
THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

JCSM-148-67

17 March 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Subject: Movement of a Corps-Size Force to  
South Vietnam (U)

1. (U) In response to your oral request to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on 2 December 1966, a study for providing and moving a corps-size force to South Vietnam (SVN) has been prepared. CINCPAC's proposal for a corps force, which was briefed to you in Honolulu during July 1966, was considered during the preparation of this study. The Services have examined their capabilities to provide such a force for deployment to SVN in an assumed emergency situation. The force compositions developed are designed to meet the numerical requirements stated by CINCPAC. The forces do not necessarily correspond to what may be required in an actual emergency condition and may not represent the optimum mix of air and ground forces required for actual operational employment. Three alternative force mixes were considered. These, together with information on shortfalls, availability dates for deployment, measures required to overcome problems, and plans for movement are contained in the attached study. The concept for their employment and command arrangements under which these forces would operate have not been considered. For the purposes of this study, it was assumed that the decision to deploy this force was made on 1 July 1967. Adjustments to the details of the study would be required in proportion to departures from this reference planning date.

2. Despite partial mobilization and drawdown on other commands, the entire corps-size force proposed by CINCPAC cannot be provided on a timely basis. However, in an emergency situation, a corps-size force, less certain shortfall units, approaching the capability of CINCPAC's proposed force could close in SVN within approximately 60 to 90 days after a decision to deploy. This force would be composed of Active Forces from CONUS, Hawaii, Japan and Okinawa bases, provided the following personnel-enabling actions were authorized:

Copy 1 of 42 Copies each  
of 6 pages series "B"

~~TOP SECRET~~

GROUP 3  
Downgraded at 10 year  
intervals; not  
automatically declassified

Declassified by Joint Staff  
Date 31 Oct 94  
FOIA 4025

OATSD(PA)DFOISR/42	
TOP SECRET CONTROL	
Copy No.	<u>R1</u>
Case No.	<u>94-F-0532</u>
T.S. No.	<u>94-TS-041</u>
Document No.	<u>2</u>

#664

941103-37

~~TOP SECRET~~

a. Tours of duty for personnel in Southeast Asia would be extended.

b. Terms of service would be extended.

c. Personnel would be returned to Southeast Asia without regard to prior service there.

d. Some units, such as air elements, would deploy to areas other than SVN as required by basing considerations.

3. The three alternative force compositions in the study were examined under certain assumptions to offer a range of options and to bring out various problem areas in fulfilling the requirement expressed by CINCPAC. Except as modified by certain existing cross-servicing agreements, force package requirements for each Service were structured to provide austere logistic self-sufficiency.

a. Alternative 1 consists of a 2-1/3 Army division force, 1 Marine division/group team, and 5 US Air Force tactical fighter squadrons (TFS). Source of forces was restricted to Active Forces in CONUS, Hawaii, Japan, and Okinawa. The 3 divisions, 8 TFS, and the bulk of the support forces available could close in SVN in 90 days.

b. Alternative 2 consists of a 1-1/3 Army division force, a Marine 2- division (-)/1-wing (-) team, and 3 US Air Force TFS. Source of forces was restricted to Active Forces in CONUS, Hawaii, Japan, and Okinawa. The 3 divisions, 8 TFS, and the bulk of the support forces available could close in SVN in 60 days.

c. Alternative 3 consists of a 3-1/3 Army division force and 8 US Air Force TFS. For this alternative, the source of forces was widened to include use of reserves and transfers of units as well as individuals from Europe and Korea. Three and one-third divisions, 8 TFS, and the bulk of the support forces available could close in SVN in 150 days. (This time could be shortened to 90 days if additional shipping is requisitioned.) It makes maximum use of flexibility inherent in Reserve callups but would have a detrimental impact on Europe. It would allow Marine ground and air forces to remain available for other missions.

~~TOP SECRET~~

4. ~~SECRET~~ Land-based tactical air or an attack carrier (CVA) may be utilized in all force packages, dependent upon the availability of CVAs, land-based fighter and attack squadrons, and base-loading problems.

5. ~~SECRET~~ Although the study assumed that tours of duty in Southeast Asia would be extended and deployment restrictions on personnel would be waived, some shortfalls in providing forces by end CY 1967 would, nevertheless, occur. Some required units are not in the force structure and some equipment would not be available. Force availability is summarized as follows:

ITEM	CINCPAC PROPOSAL	FORCES AVAILABLE WITHIN 180 DAYS		
		ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3
Strength	134,536	116,927	118,212	123,901
(Army)	(121,685)	( 68,305)	( 42,090)	(113,718)
(Navy) <sup>1/</sup>	( 1,380)	( 0)	( 0)	( 1,380)
(Air Force)	( 11,471)	( 8,176)	( 6,760)	( 8,803)
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	( 40,446)	( 69,362)	( 0)
Maneuver Bns	31 <sup>2/</sup>	31	29	33
(Army)	(31)	(20)	(11)	(33)
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	(11)	(18)	( 0)
Artillery Bns	24 <sup>3/</sup>	20-2/3	20	24
(Army)	(24)	(16)	(11)	(24)
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	(4-2/3)	( 9)	( 0)
Engr Bns	17 <sup>4/</sup>	11	12	15
(Army)	(16)	( 7)	( 6)	(15)
(Navy)	( 0)	( 1)	( 2)	( 0)
(Air Force)	( 1)	( 0)	( 0)	( 0)
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	( 3)	( 4)	( 0)

~~SECRET~~  
Page 3

941103-39

~~TOP SECRET~~

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>CINCPAC PROPOSAL</u>	<u>ALT 1</u>	<u>ALT 2</u>	<u>ALT 3</u>
Helo Co/Sqdn	24 <sup>5/</sup>	11-1/2	10-1/2	6
(Army)	(24)	( 3)	( 2)	( 6)
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	( 8-1/2)	( 8-1/2)	( 0)
TFS	8	8	8	8
(Air Force)	( 8)	( 5)	( 3)	( 8)
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	( 3)	( 5)	( 0)
LST (Navy)	12	0	0	12

NOTES: 1/ US Navy personnel organic or attached to US Marine Corps units included in Marine Corps figures.

2/ Includes requirement for armored cavalry regiment of 3 maneuver battalions.

3/ Includes an artillery battalion equivalent organic to the armored cavalry regiment and organic division artillery.

4/ Includes engineer battalions organic to divisions and an Air Force civil engineer squadron.

5/ Includes 13 helicopter company equivalents organic to an airmobile division and organic division helicopter companies.

6. ~~TOP SECRET~~ In alternative 1, above, certain available Marine Corps forces were added to compensate for Army shortfalls after the latter were determined. In alternative 2, certain supplemental Army forces were added in the area of corps support to tailor the force more closely to CINCPAC's proposal.

~~TOP SECRET~~

941-13-40

~~TOP SECRET~~

7. (S) The effect of shortfalls in the above mixes upon the capability of the force to conduct military operations is considered significant but tolerable. The shortfall limitations would occur in helicopter lift, engineer support, terminal services, tactical air support aircraft, and other combat service support. In alternatives 1 and 2, an armored cavalry regiment is not available, although additional infantry/tank battalions are provided which offset this shortfall to some extent. Because present in-country resources in these categories are fully taxed in current missions, diversion to support the corps-size force during its deployment and buildup in SVN would degrade on-going operations somewhat. In the first two alternatives, certain shortfalls could be overcome to a significant extent by selected Reserve callups and transfer of units from Europe and other areas.

8. (S) The study indicates that the impact on the US military posture worldwide of providing this force to SVN would be significant. This impact is substantially greater in alternative 3, which includes transfers from Europe and other areas. However, this impact has not been examined in detail since it was considered beyond the scope of the study.

9. (S) In planning the movement of forces to Southeast Asia, various combinations of transport resources were considered. One Army division would be airlifted in all three alternatives. In the first two alternatives, the Marine assault echelons would be combat loaded and deployed in organic amphibious shipping. Remaining forces would be deployed both by MSTS sealift and MAC airlift. In the third alternative, organic amphibious shipping other than LSTs would not be used. Airlift/sealift resources in support of other commitments in other areas of the world would be reduced to a minimum, but airlift would not be reduced below the minimum JCS-assured airlift currently allocated. The flow of supplies and necessary replacements to forces already in Southeast Asia and deployment of Program 4 forces would not be affected. The readiness of units, the quantity of transport available, and the capability to receive and unload at the destination were the parameters which determined the time phasing and rapidity of movement of the force. These factors are discussed in the study in some detail. The following data summarize some of the major movement statistics:

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

<u>ALT 1</u>	<u>Passengers</u>	<u>Short Tons</u>	<u>Measurement Tons</u>	<u>Pass Ships</u>	<u>Cargo Ships</u>	<u>Airlift Sorties</u>
Air	39,073	55,143				2,852
MSTS	58,439		565,714	16	48	
Amphib	37,052		157,833			
<u>ALT 2</u>						
Air	36,959	61,090				2,930
MSTS	36,494		371,456	12	31	
Amphib	57,026	.	268,178			
<u>ALT 3</u>						
Air	37,011	52,137				2,417
MSTS	94,490		697,626	16	60	

NOTE: 1/ Includes all personnel that would become available through CY 1968.

10. ~~cc~~ The Joint Chiefs of Staff conclude that the study will be useful in assisting the decision-making process and as an aid in planning should an emergency situation arise in Southeast Asia requiring a large, additional force to be deployed. However, the exact composition of such a force would have to be task organized at that time to provide an appropriate response to the emergency. They note that any actions taken to accelerate or increase currently approved deployments to SVN would have significant impact on the capabilities outlined above.

For the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Signed

J. O. COBB  
Rear Admiral, USN  
Deputy Director, Joint Staff

Attachments

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

COPY 9 OF 50 COPIES  
ATTACHMENT TO JCSM-148-67

# Study MOVEMENT OF A CORPS-SIZE FORCE TO SOUTH VIETNAM (U)



---

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF  
Washington, D.C.

20301

GROUP-3  
DOWNGRADED AT 12 YEAR  
INTERVALS; NOT  
AUTOMATICALLY DECLASSIFIED

~~TOP SECRET~~

941103-43



14 March 1967

MOVEMENT OF A CORPS-SIZE FORCE TO SOUTH VIETNAM (U)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
- Readyng and Deploying a Corps-Size Force to Vietnam	1
Annex A - Assumed Emergency Situation	11
Annex B - Force Packages for Analysis	12
Annex C - Force Requirements vs Capabilities to Provide Forces	14
Annex D - Shortfalls and Problem Areas	20
Tab A - Shortfalls	22
Tab B - Army Data on Shortfalls	23
Tab C - US Air Force Problem Areas	24
Annex E - Movement Data	30
Tab A - Alternative I	32
Tab B - Alternative II	33
Tab C - Alternative III	34

GROUP 3  
DOWNGRADED AT 12 YEAR INTERVALS;  
NOT AUTOMATICALLY DECLASSIFIED

941103-44

## READYING AND DEPLOYING A CORPS-SIZE FORCE TO VIETNAM

1. Introduction. This is a study to:

a. Determine the Services' capabilities to provide a force of corps size; and

b. Develop a plan for moving it to South Vietnam (SVN) in response to an emergency situation.

To provide a foundation and framework for the study, certain assumptions are made and three alternative compositions for a corps-size force have been established. CINCPAC's requirement for a corps contingency force has been considered during the preparation of this study.

2. Assumptions. The following assumptions are made:

a. The emergency situation would be similar to that described in Annex A.

b. All Program 4 forces would be deployed as planned; however, except for the corps force, no forces beyond Program 4 would be deployed. Possible force requirements for the "Practice Nine" project have not been considered.

c. Authority would be granted to withdraw and redistribute equipment, supplies, and critical skilled personnel worldwide.

d. Tours of duty in Southeast Asia/WESTPAC and other overseas areas, as required, would be extended and deployment restrictions on personnel would be waived as necessary.

e. Terms of service would be extended as required.

f. Decision to ready and deploy forces and collateral decisions would be made on 1 July 1967.

g. Some units, such as air elements, would deploy to areas outside SVN as required by basing considerations.

GROUP 3  
DOWNGRADED AT 12 YEAR INTERVALS;  
NOT AUTOMATICALLY DECLASSIFIED

3. Alternative Force Packages. The basic elements of the corps force could be provided in several ways. To determine the best way to provide the forces, it appears desirable to examine three alternative force packages. Thus, the problem areas and also the most advantageous situations will be brought to light.

The major force packages are:

a. Two and one-third Army divisions, 1 Marine division/group team, and 5 tactical fighter squadrons (TFS).

b. One and one-third Army divisions, a Marine 2-division (-)/ 1-wing (-) team, and 3 TFS.

c. Three and one-third Army divisions and 8 TFS.

Dependent upon the availability of land-based fighter and attack squadrons and base loading problems, land-based tactical air or an attack carrier (CVA) could become interchangeable in all force packages. Details of these force packages are in Annex B. Because it would become necessary to call up Reserves as a follow-on measure to reconstitute the necessary training and sustaining base, it is considered useful to examine the third alternative under circumstances in which the optimum flexibility afforded by a call up of Reserves could be used. This would include possible transfers of Active units from Europe and Korea to be replaced as soon as practicable by Reserve units or deployment of Reserve units to Southeast Asia.

4. Capability to Provide the Force

a. The military services are capable of providing forces to make up a corps-size force under the above assumptions as they apply to the three alternatives as follows:

~~TOP SECRET~~

ITEM	CINCPAC PROPOSAL	FORCES AVAILABLE WITHIN 180 DAYS			
		ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3	
Strength	134,536	116,927	118,212	123,901	1
(Army)	(121,685)	( 68,305)	( 42,090)	(113,718)	2
(Navy) <sup>1/</sup>	( 1,380)	( 0)	( 0)	( 1,380)	3
(Air Force)	( 11,471)	( 8,176)	( 6,760)	( 8,803)	4
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	( 40,446)	( 69,362)	( 0)	5
Maneuver Bns	31 <sup>2/</sup>	31	29	33	6
(Army)	(31)	(20)	(11)	(33)	7
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	(11)	(18)	( 0)	8
Artillery Bns	24 <sup>3/</sup>	20-2/3	20	24	9
(Army)	(24)	(16)	(11)	(24)	10
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	( 4-2/3)	( 9)	( 0)	11
Engr Bns	17 <sup>4/</sup>	11	12	15	12
(Army)	(16)	( 7)	( 6)	(15)	13
(Navy)	( 0)	( 1)	( 2)	( 0)	14
(Air Force)	( 1)	( 0)	( 0)	( 0)	15
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	( 3)	( 4)	( 0)	16
Helo Co/Sqdn	24 <sup>5/</sup>	11-1/2	10-1/2	6	17
(Army)	(24)	( 3)	( 2)	( 6)	18
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	( 8-1/2)	( 8-1/2)	( 0)	19
TFS	8	8	8	8	20
(Air Force)	( 8)	( 5)	( 3)	( 8)	21
(Marine Corps)	( 0)	( 3)	( 5)	( 0)	22
LST (Navy)	12	0	0	12	23

NOTES: <sup>1/</sup> US Navy personnel organic or attached to US  
Marine Corps units included in Marine Corps  
figures.

<sup>2/</sup> Includes requirement for armored cavalry  
regiment of three maneuver bns.

~~TOP SECRET~~

- 3/ Includes an artillery bn equivalent organic to the armored cavalry regiment and organic division artillery.
  - 4/ Includes engineer bns organic to divisions and and Air Force civil engineer squadron.
  - 5/ Includes 13 helicopter company equivalents organic to an airmobile division and organic division helo companies.
- b. In alternative 1, certain available Marine Corps forces were added after the Army shortfalls were determined. These added forces would fill some of those shortfalls and thus enhance the over-all operational capability of the forces.
- c. In alternative 2, certain supplemental Army forces were added in the area of corps support to tailor the force more closely to CINCPAC's proposal.
- d. Details of the forces and their availability for deployment are in Annex C. The major shortfalls are as follows:
- (1) Army: Helicopter units, engineer units, terminal service units, and petroleum supply units. The Army forces' mobility and ability to construct and maintain LOCs and facilities would be limited and support would be austere.
  - (2) Navy: The shortage of nonorganic resupply T-LSTs would degrade the ability of COMUSMACV to transport supplies along the coast of SVN.
  - (3) Air Forces: Civil engineer, heavy repair squadron(s), and a tactical air support squadron (TASS). The engineer shortfalls would cause heavier workloads on existing units that provide these services or require augmentation by TDY units until they can be overcome. The TASS shortfalls would cause dispersion of present resources in SVN until O-2 aircraft production becomes available.

(4) Marine Corps: Some interrogator-translator teams and 3 1/2 helicopter squadrons (alternative 2 only). Helicopter mobility would be curtailed to some extent by this shortfall.

5. (b) Problems in Readyng the Force and Means of Solving Them (see Annex D for details).

a. Army. Primary problems are to overcome the above-mentioned shortfalls and reconstitute the sustaining base to a posture which would allow it to sustain deployments. Many, but not all, of the shortfalls could be met through withdrawal of units from overseas commands, call-up of selected Reserve units and personnel, sole-source or off-shelf procurement of equipment, and expansion of the existing Army force structure. In cases where the limiting factor is an absolute requirement for long lead-time production of military hardware (e.g., aircraft), no action to overcome shortfall is possible. Specific problems are addressed below:

(1) Use of STRAF. The loss of up to three divisions from the STRAF significantly reduces the ability to respond rapidly to contingencies in other areas of the world. The use of NATO earmarked divisions and combat and combat support units will further degrade the already weakened posture in this Alliance. To ready existing units rapidly requires drawdown of resources from remaining STRAF units as well as some school support units which have general war missions. Most personnel shortages in the units drawn down could be replaced from the Reserves; however, equipment shortages cannot be replaced until CY 1968 and early CY 1969 except, in some cases, through extraordinary logistic actions such as sole-source procurement contracts or off-shelf purchase of like civilian items.

(2) Withdrawals from other overseas commands.

1  
2 Withdrawing units from Europe and Korea to either offset  
3 a shortfall (alternative 1 or 2) or meet criteria of a  
4 force option (alternative 3) will significantly reduce  
5 combat capability in these areas. For example,  
6 alternative 3 requires withdrawal from Europe of  
7 70 percent of all nondivisional engineer combat  
8 battalions, all medium helicopter companies, 55  
9 percent of the light/medium truck companies,  
10 80 percent of general support artillery battalions,  
11 and 45 percent of the armored cavalry squadrons; from  
12 Korea, this alternative requires withdrawal of all trans-  
13 portation terminal service companies and the remaining  
14 medium helicopter company.

15 (3) Sustainability. Even assuming the indefinite  
16 suspension of rotation, to meet and sustain the expanded  
17 Southeast Asia requirement will require expansion of  
18 the Active Army to offset the steady erosion of the  
19 remaining STRAF which must be used to provide replace-  
20 ments for combat attrition. Ultimately, even alterna-  
21 tives 1 and 2 will probably require call-up of  
22 Reserve forces, particularly if any rotation policy  
23 is to be reestablished.

24 b. Navy. Amphibious assault shipping is available world-  
25 wide to lift one and two-thirds Marine Corps division/wing  
26 teams. However, approximately 40 percent of organic Navy  
27 amphibious shipping is forward deployed (2/9 - 3/9 WESTPAC,  
28 1/9 EUCOM, 1/9 Caribbean). The LST component of the  
29 amphibious force is more heavily committed because of its  
30 unique over-the-beach unloading capability. Sixty-seven  
31 percent of the LSTs in PACOM are deployed to or maintained  
32 in the Western Pacific. MSTC operates 36 LSTs, all foreign

manned, in the Western Pacific and Southeast Asia engaged in point-to-point and intratheater lift in support of the present level of operations in Vietnam. Five CVAs are maintained continuously in the Seventh Fleet. Three of these are engaged at any one time. Additionally, 2 are maintained forward deployed in EUCOM, for a total of 7 (or 47 percent) deployed continuously. A fourth CVA could be engaged in support of a corps-size force, but only at the expense of a sustained capability, by deploying an additional CVA or drawing down on other forward deployments.

c. Air Force. Any of the three alternatives can be supported to provide additional forces to reinforce PACOM in an assumed emergency. Extraordinary measures, such as temporary reduction of the CONUS training base and revision of Air Force personnel rotation policies, would be required to meet deployments in the July-December period for all three alternatives, and some unit reequipping in PACAF would be delayed. Without withdrawal of a tactical reconnaissance squadron (TRS) from Europe (not considered advisable), the required TRS does not become available until November 1967 except in alternative 3 wherein Air National Guard (ANG) are available in July 1967. Provision of two TCS reduces STRICOM tactical airlift capability. Personnel for supporting units are available from worldwide resources; however, augmentation to 100 percent manning level by withdrawals from other units presently manned at 80 - 90 percent will impact on the donor units. Airbase saturation in Southeast Asia is a matter of record, and additional deployments would make the upgrading of Nam Phong a matter of urgency. While interim deployments in an emergency could be accommodated at existing bases for alternatives 1 and 2, such arrangements would further aggravate a situation already critical. Additional air base improvements should be initiated concurrent



~~TOP SECRET~~

with a decision to ready the force for deployment. Increased 1  
authorities and funding are required concurrent with a decision 2  
for organizing/equipping the civil engineer RED HORSE squadrons 3  
and for additional procurement of war consumables. The required 4  
TASS O-2 aircraft can be provided only from new production and 5  
would be an unsatisfied shortfall until the period February - 6  
May 1968. To provide augmentation for the Tactical Air Control 7  
Party (TACP) to meet requirements in August 1967 will require 8  
revision of Air Force rotation policies. 9

d. Marine Corps. Assuming the actions included in paragraph 10  
2 are taken, there are no initial major personnel problems 11  
for the Marine Corps forces for alternatives 1 and 2. If 12  
the emergency should continue for a prolonged period, the 13  
sustaining base would have to be reconstituted, and, if 14  
rotation were resumed, it would be necessary to mobilize in 15  
order to provide a rotation base. However, with regard to 16  
logistics, without mobilization, increased funding and 17  
industrial output would be required to sustain the forces 18  
with principal items beyond D + 180. This requirement could 19  
occur sooner for secondary items depending on the manner in 20  
which additional operations would create peculiar demands in 21  
both items and quantities. 22

#### 6. (15) Logistic Considerations 23

a. The corps force, under any of the three alternative 24  
mixes, will operate under field conditions or use existing 25  
facilities in the operational area. Garrison-type equip- 26  
ment would not be utilized or accompany the force. Air 27  
elements would occupy Southeast Asia airfields wherever 28  
they could best be accommodated. It is noted that an 29  
expeditionary airfield (SATS) is included in the Marine 30  
expeditionary force (MEF). Therefore, logistic support would 31  
be limited to that essential to enable the force to accomplish 32  
its mission. In view of these facts, the primary logistic 33

~~TOP SECRET~~

consideration for this force is a matter of availability of  
air and sealift and the capability of air and sea ports and  
beaches to receive the force. In-country transshipment of this  
force have not been considered in the preparation of this study.

b. Plans for moving the forces for each alternative have  
been developed and are contained in Annex E. US transportation  
resources would be fully committed for a period of approximately  
four months. During this time, airlift for other areas would  
be near the minimum JCS-assured allocation; amphibious shipping  
and MSTs lift elsewhere would be at a minimum. The movement  
plans indicate the following:

Alternative 1: Three reinforced divisions, 8 TFS, and the  
bulk of support forces moved by 30 September.

Alternative 2: Three divisions, 8 TFS, and the bulk of  
support forces moved by 31 August.

Alternative 3: Three and one-third divisions, 8 TFS, and the  
bulk of support forces moved by 30 November.

This date could be improved approximately 60  
days by requisitioning shipping.

c. Shipping required and airlift sorties required for the  
movement are indicated in detail in Annex E.

d. Offloading capabilities in Vietnam would appear to be  
adequate if the force moves as shown in the schedules and  
is not limited to a small number of the ports available.  
This factor is further discussed in Annex E.

7. ~~(S)~~ Summary. The three alternative force mixes offer  
a choice of options, the major features of which are:

a. Alternative 1: Uses Active forces from the Army,  
Air Force, and Marine Corps so as to balance the impact  
among these three Services. Leaves II MEF(-) to meet NATO  
commitments; however, employs one of the NATO committed

~~TOP SECRET~~

Army divisions. No units would be withdrawn from Europe. 1  
Three divisions, 8 TFS, and the bulk of the support forces 2  
could be moved to SVN in 90 days. 3

b. Alternative 2: Makes maximum use of Marine Corps 4  
forces. This leaves the 5th US Army Division to meet NATO 5  
commitments; however, it employs II MEF which is NATO 6  
committed. No units would be withdrawn from Europe. This 7  
alternative would place 3 divisions, 8 TFS, and the 8  
bulk of the support forces in SVN in the shortest time, 9  
60 days. This force would be less dependent on port and 10  
airfield facilities. 11

c. Alternative 3: Provides an all-Army ground force 12  
and an all-Air Force air element with lower shortfalls a 13  
a greater capability for inland sustained operations. 14  
Three and one third divisions, 8 TFS, and the bulk of 15  
the support forces could be moved to SVN in 150 days. 16  
(This time could be shortened to 90 days if additional 17  
shipping is requisitioned.) It makes maximum use of flexi- 18  
bility inherent in Reserve call-ups but would have a detri- 19  
mental impact on Europe. It would allow Marine ground and 20  
air forces to remain available for other missions. 21

#### ANNEXES

A. Assumed Emergency Situation	22
B. Alternate Force Packages	23
C. Force Requirements versus Capabilities	24
D. Shortfalls and Problem Areas	25
Tab A - Shortfalls	26
Tab B - Army Shortfall Data	27
Tab C - Air Force Problem Areas	28
E. Movement Data	29
Tab A - Movement Schedule for Alternative 1	30
Tab B - Movement Schedule for Alternative 2	31
Tab C - Movement Schedule for Alternative 3	32
	33

~~TOP SECRET~~

941103-54

~~SECRET~~

ANNEX A

ASSUMED EMERGENCY SITUATION

1. ~~(S)~~ The emergency situation which would generate the need for a corps size force in SVN would have to be of a serious nature to warrant the expedient measures necessary to provide the force. It would have to be clearly apparent to the National Command Authorities that the emergency would lead to the destruction or loss of a substantial part of US forces unless remedial action were taken.
2. ~~(S)~~ Such an emergency might consist of the imminent over-running of friendly forces in the I Corps Tactical Zone; or a heavy enemy thrust from the central highlands toward Qui Nhon to split the country in two; or the encirclement and threatened capture of Saigon by heavy enemy forces.
3. ~~(S)~~ In such a situation, some forces already in SVN probably would have been shifted to meet the threat. The incoming forces could act as reinforcements, replace those forces in vacated areas, or engage in other offensive roles.

~~SECRET~~

041103-55

## ANNEX B

## FORCE PACKAGES FOR ANALYSIS

1. ~~(S)~~ The following alternative Force Packages are to be analyzed for readying and deploying to Southeast Asia.
- a. First Alternative. Use of active forces in CONUS, Hawaii, Japan, and Okinawa.
- (1) Army Forces
    - (a) Abn division from CONUS
    - (b) Mech division from CONUS (converted to an inf division)
    - (c) 3 inf bns from Hawaii (to round out above forces).
    - (d) Armed cav regt (CONUS resources).
  - (2) Marine Corps Forces
    - (a) Marine division (reinforced as necessary from CONUS resources)
    - (b) Marine air forces equivalent to 3 squadrons.
  - (3) Air Forces
    - 5 TFS from CONUS.
  - (4) Amphibious lift for Marine Corps forces plus T-1STs to perform coastal shipping.
- b. Second Alternative. Use of active forces in CONUS, Hawaii, Japan, and Okinawa.
- (1) Army Forces
    - (a) Abn division from CONUS (reinforced by 2 battalions).
    - (b) Armored cav regt (CONUS resources).
  - (2) Marine Corps Forces
    - 2 divisions (minus 2/9) with air support equivalent to 5 squadrons.
  - (3) Air Forces
    - 3 TFS from CONUS.

941103-56

~~TOP SECRET~~

(4) Navy Forces

Same as in alternative 1.

c. Third Alternative. Use of active and reserve forces  
and some Europe transfers.

(1) Army Forces

(a) 3 infantry divisions.

(b) Armored cav regiment.

(2) Marine Corps Forces - None.

(3) Air Forces

8 TFS.

(4) Navy Forces

12 LSTs.

d. Dependent upon the availability of land-based  
fighter and attack squadrons and base loading in-country  
and in Thailand, a CVA could be sustained in all force  
packages.

~~TOP SECRET~~

941103-57

Force 1/ Navy Forces	Personnel		Units Required				Helo Co/Sq	Date Ready For Deployment	Remarks
	Required	Available	Men	Eng	Art	Tac Sqd			
T-1STs	1,380	0							
Air Force									
Tac Ftr Sqds, Tac Ftr Wg, and Base Operating Support	3,081	3,081				5		July-Sep 67	Shortfall
Air Force Support Forces	5,729	5,095						Aug 67	Shortfall includes civil engr sqdn and TASS (634 pers)
Total Air Forces	8,810	8,176				5			
Marine Corps Forces									
5th Mar Div	20,005	20,005	9	1	4			July	
Support for 5th Mar Div	11,575	11,494	1	2	2/3			July	Shortfall is 81 personnel
Air Elements	4,587	3,741				3	6	July-Oct 67	Shortfall includes 2 1/2 helo sqdns (846 pers)
Subtotal MC Forces	36,167	35,240	10	3	4 2/3	3	6		Total Marine Corps shortfall 927 pers
Supplementary MC forces to fill Army shortfalls 2/		5,206						July-Oct	This includes 1 maneuver bn, 1 engr bn, and 5 helo sqdns.
Total Forces	126,486	116,727	34	13	21 2/3	8	18		
Total Shortfall	19,559		3	2	1		6 1/2		

1/ Grouped for movement purposes  
 2/ These supplementary forces would be withdrawn from II MEF which would be degraded correspondingly. They would be used primarily to fill Army shortfalls although two and one-half helo squadrons could be applied against the Marine Corps shortfall.

SECRET

ANNEX C

FORCE REQUIREMENTS VS CAPABILITIES TO PROVIDE FORCES

ALTERNATIVE 1

Forces 1/ Army Forces	Personnel		Units Required					Helo CO/Sqd	Date Ready For Deployment	Remarks
	Required	Available	Man	Eng	Air	Tac Sqd				
Corps Hqs	1,990	1,550							Aug	
82nd Abn Div	15,865	15,865	9	1	3			1	Jul	
5th Mech Div	16,851	16,851	10	1	4			1	Sep	
Armd Cav Regt	3,349		3		1				Feb 68	Entire unit is considered a shortfall
Support Forces for 82nd Div	18,390	13,937	1	3	4			4	Aug-Dec	Shortfall includes 3 helo cos
Support Forces for 5th Div	15,260	8,738		3	3			4	Aug-Dec	Shortfall includes 1 engr on and 4 helo cos
Support Forces for Corps	18,404	11,363	1	2	2			2	Aug-Dec	Shortfall includes 1 man bn, 2 engr bns, and 2 helo cos
Total Army Forces	90,129	68,305	24	10	17			12		Total Army shortfall includes 4 man bns, 3 engr bns, 1 arty bn and 9 helo cos. (21,624 pers)

1/ Grouped for movement purposes



ALTERNATIVE 2

Force 1/	Personnel		Units Required					Helo Co/Sqd	Date Ready For Deployment	Remarks
	Required	Available	Man	Eng	Art	Tac Sgd				
<u>Army Forces</u>										
82nd Abn Div	15,905	15,905	9	1	3		1	July	1 bn not ready til August	
Armored Cav Regt	3,349	0	3		1			Feb 68	Entire unit considered a shortfall	
Support Forces for 82nd Div	20,452	15,588	2	4	4		4	Aug-Dec 67	Shortfall includes 1 engr bn and 3 helo cos (4,864 pers)	
Subtotal Army Forces	39,706	31,493	14	5	8		5			
Supplementary Corps support forces	16,597	10,597	—	4	4		1	Aug-Dec 67	Shortfall in corps forces include 2 engr bn and 1 helo co (600 pers)	
Total Army Forces	56,303	42,090	14	9	12		6		Total Army shortfall includes 3 man ons, 3 engr bns, 1 arty bn, and 4 helo cos (14,213 pers)	
<u>Navy Forces</u>										
T-1STs	1,380	0							Shortfall	
<u>Air Forces</u>										
Tac Ftr Sqs, Tac Ftr Wg, and BOS	1,731	1,731				3		Jul-Aug 67		
AF Support Forces	5,602	5,029				—		Aug 67	Shortfall includes a civil engr sqdn and TASS (573 pers)	
Total Air Forces	7,333	6,760				3				
<u>Marine Corps Forces</u>										
Corps Hqs	MEC	278						July		
5th Mar Div	20,005	20,005	9	1	4			July		
2nd Mar Div	17,124	17,124	7	1	3 2/3			July		
1/ Grouped for movement purposes										
Annex C										

1/ Grouped for movement purposes

941103-60

Force 1/ Marine Corps Forces (cont)	Personnel		Units Required				Helo Co/Sqd	Date Ready For Deployment	Remarks
	Required	Available	Man	Eng	Art	Tac Sqd			
Support for 5th Mar Div	12,687	12,611	1	2	2/3			July	Shortfall of 76 pers
Support for 2nd Mar Div	7,517	7,442	1	2	2/3			July	Shortfall of 75 pers
Air Elements	12,954	11,802				5	12	July-Oct 67	Shortfall of 1,152 pers includes 3 1/2 helo sqdns
Total MC Forces	70,665	69,362	18	6	9	5	12		Total Marine Corps shortfall 1,303 pers
Total Forces	135,681	118,212	32	15	21	8	18		
Total Shortfall	17,469		3	3	1		7 1/2		

1/ Grouped for movement purposes

SECRET

ALTERNATIVE 3

Force 1/	Personnel		Units Required					Helo	Date Ready For Deployment	Remarks
	Required	Available	Man	Eng	Art	Tac Sqd	Co/Sqd			
Army Forces										
Corps Hqs	1,550	1,550							Aug 67	
82nd Div	15,865	15,865	9	1	3			1	Jul 67	
101st Div	15,865	15,865	9	1	3			1	Sep 67	
5th Div	17,527	17,527	11	1	4			1	Sep 67	
Armored Cav Regt	3,349	3,349	3		1				Aug 67	
82nd Div Support	18,536	16,677		3	4			4	Aug-Dec 67	Shortfall includes 2 helo cos
101st Div Support	16,511	13,900		4	3			4	Aug-Dec 67	Shortfall includes 4 helo cos
5th Div Support	16,483	12,827		4	2			4	Aug-Dec 67	Shortfall includes 2 arty bns and 3 helo cos
Support Forces for Corps	19,803	16,158	1	1	3			2	Aug-Dec 67	Shortfall includes 2 helo cos
Total Army Forces	125,489	113,718	33	15	24			17		Total Army shortfall includes 2 arty bns and 11 helo cos (11,771 pers)
Navy Forces										
W-1STs	1,380	1,380							Aug 67	
1/ Grouped for movement purposes										

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

<u>Force<sup>1/</sup></u>	<u>Personnel</u>		<u>Units Required</u>				<u>Helo</u> <u>Co/Sqd</u>	<u>Date Ready</u> <u>For Deployment</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
	<u>Required</u>	<u>Available</u>	<u>Battalions</u>		<u>Tac</u> <u>Sqd</u>				
	<u>Man</u>	<u>Eng</u>	<u>Art</u>						
<u>Air Forces</u>									
Tac Ftr Sqs, Tac Ftr Wing, and Base Operating Spt	3,886					8		July-Aug 67	
Air Force Support	6,014							Aug 67	Shortfall includes 2 civil engr sqdns and 1 TASS (1097 pers)
Total Air Forces	9,900	8,803				8			
Total Forces	136,769	123,901	33	15	24	8	17		
Total Shortfall		12,868			2		11		

<sup>1/</sup> Grouped for movement purposes

TOP SECRET

~~SECRET~~

## ANNEX D

### SHORTFALLS AND PROBLEM AREAS

1. ~~(S)~~ Additional information on shortfalls and problem areas is provided herein.

a. In alternative 1 after the Services had determined their capabilities to provide forces, there was a substantial Army shortfall as indicated in Tabs A and B. This resulted from the Army absorbing the requirement to provide corps support for the entire force. Subsequently, it was determined that certain Marine Corps forces could be made available to overcome some of the Army shortfalls. Hence, these Marine Corps forces, which include five helicopter squadrons, have been added to those forces that can be made available and are subtracted from the shortfall.

b. In alternative 2, after the Services had determined their capabilities to provide forces, it became apparent that, to meet CINCPAC requirements for a force capable of sustained inland operations, additional corps support would be required. Therefore, in addition to providing support for a divisional slice, the Army was tasked to supply supplementary forces to fill out the needed corps support forces. These types of forces are not normally found in the Marine Corps force structure.

2. ~~(S)~~ Tabs A and B are spread sheets which give an analysis of the shortfalls. From this analysis, the following are significant findings:

a. Army

(1) In all alternatives a significant number of shortfalls could be made available in 1968 through activations of units, which are already scheduled:

~~SECRET~~

941103-64

~~SECRET~~

- (a) Alternative 1 - 76 percent. 1
- (b) Alternative 2 - 90 percent. 2
- (c) Alternative 3 - 68 percent. 3

Units that cannot be made available in 1968 must await  
long lead-time procurement. 4 5

(2) In alternatives 1 and 2, approximately 70 percent  
of the shortfalls could be overcome by a call-up of selected  
Reserves and by transferring units from Europe and Korea  
(less than 10 percent represents Reserve call-up). 6 7 8 9

(3) In alternative 3, there appear to be no additional  
steps that could be taken to overcome the shortfalls  
except sole-source and off-the-shelf procurement with lib-  
eral commercial substitutes. A quantitative estimate of  
the shortfalls that could thus be overcome has not been made. 10 11 12 13 14

b. Air Force. Air Force shortfalls in all three alterna-  
tives are in civil engineer units (RED HORSE) which are not  
in the Active forces and in TASS O-2 aircraft which must be  
provided from new production. For further detail, see  
Tab C. 15 16 17 18 19

c. Navy. The Navy shortfall of 12 LSTs in alternatives  
1 and 2 can only be solved by withdrawing them from other  
areas. 20 21 22

d. Marine Corps. Overcoming helicopter unit shortfalls  
is dependent on production and pilot procurement. Interpreter  
and translator team shortfalls can be made up after 18 months'  
training time. 23 24 25 26

3. (U) Tab C is a discussion of Air Force shortfalls and  
problem areas. 27 28

~~SECRET~~

941103-65

TAB A TO ANNEX D

SHORTFALLS

	Total Shortfall	Amount That Could be Overcome By Call-up of Reserves	Amount that Could be Overcome By Transfers From Other Areas	Amount Still Not Available
<u>ALTERNATIVE 1</u>	23,919 <sup>1/</sup>	1,363	14,350	8,206
Army	21,824 <sup>1/</sup>	1,363	12,970	7,491
Air Force	634	--	--	634
Navy	1,380	--	1,380	0
MC	81	--	--	81
<u>ALTERNATIVE 2</u>	17,469	1,291	10,726	5,552
Army	8,213	749	5,488	1,976
Air Force	573	--	--	573
Navy	1,380	--	1,380	--
MC	1,303	--	--	1,303
Army Supple- mentary Corps Support	6,000	442	3,858	1,700
<u>ALTERNATIVE 3</u>	12,868	--	--	12,868
Army	11,771	--	--	11,771
Air Force	1,097	--	--	1,097

<sup>1/</sup> This shortfall can be reduced by 4,360 through use of supplementary Marine Corps forces but is listed here in full for accounting purposes.

ARMY DATA ON SHORTFALLS

Unit	Shortfall	Possible Offsets <sup>1/</sup>				Unknown Availability	Possible Offsets <sup>2/</sup>	
		Available in 68	Amount From Reserves	Amount From Transfers	Amount From Reserves		Amount From Transfers	
<u>ALTERNATIVE 1</u>								
ACR	21,824 <sup>3/</sup>	16,004	731	11,433	5,820	632	1,537	
Support for 82nd Div	3,349	3,349	0	3,349	0	0	0	
Support for 82nd Div	4,453	4,201	262	2,578	252	78	116	
Support for 5th Div	6,542	4,896	233	3,861	1,646	61	198	
Support for Corps	7,480	3,558	236	1,645	3,922	493	1,223	
<u>ALTERNATIVE 2</u>								
ACR	14,213	12,603	657	9,006	1,610	534	340	
Support for 82nd Div	3,349	3,349	0	3,349	0	0	0	
Support for 82nd Div	4,864	4,124	657	2,024	740	92	115	
Supplementary Corps Support	6,000	5,130	0	3,633	870	442	225	
<u>ALTERNATIVE 3</u>								
Support for 82nd Div	11,771	7,882	---	---	3,889	---	---	
Support for 82nd Div	1,859	1,836			23			
Support for 101st Div	2,611	1,048			1,563			
Support for 5th Div	3,656	2,280			1,376			
Support for Corps	3,645	2,718			927			

- <sup>1/</sup> Possible offsets to provide in CY 67 those shortfalls that are scheduled to be provided in CY 68.
- <sup>2/</sup> Possible offsets to provide in CY 67 those shortfalls for which no date of availability is known.
- <sup>3/</sup> This shortfall can be reduced by 4,360 through use of supplementary Marine Corps forces but is listed here in full for accounting purposes.



~~TOP SECRET~~

TAB C TO ANNEX D

US AIR FORCE PROBLEM AREAS

1. ~~TOP SECRET~~ During the period July - December 1967, the Air Force will have the capability to provide up to six tactical fighter squadrons for deployment under an assumed emergency situation. However, there are no additional assets available for a corresponding increase to the CONUS training base to provide for sustained support above the level of forces currently engaged in Southeast Asia. Therefore, these additional deployable units could be sustained for only a short period of time. In this analysis, the possible duration of engagement, or deployment, for the corps size force is not addressed. It is prudent to assume that it may continue for an extended period of time. Since maintenance of an adequate sustaining base is considered critical, both to support deployed forces and to insure a viable capability for other contingency requirements, the data in this Tab are based upon increasing the CONUS training base as additive deployments are executed.

2. ~~TOP SECRET~~ Deployment of additional forces in any alternative can best be accommodated by use of Nam Phong Air Base, in Thailand, to avoid further saturation of operation facilities at other Southeast Asia airfields, to retain some beddown capability in SVN for follow-on forces, and to provide some flexibility. This base is presently being completed to bare-base configuration and would require upgrading to a main operating base capability to support three tactical fighter squadrons (TFS). Tactical operations can be supported initially on an austere basis with TDY PRIME BEEF personnel deployed in advance of tactical units by use of a GRAY EAGLE package and tactical airfield

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

dispensing system (TAFDS). Additional base improvements required would be completed thereafter by a heavy repair (RED HORSE) squadron and organic civil engineer personnel to support sustained operations.

3. ~~(13)~~ Problem areas associated with each alternative, and possible corrective actions, are discussed in the following paragraphs.

4. ~~(13)~~ Alternative 1 (5 TFS, 1 tactical reconnaissance squadron (TRS), 2 Troop carrier squadrons (TCS), and Associated Units):

a. Under present programmed aircraft equipage schedules and with projected aircraft losses in Southeast Asia, the Air Force can deploy and provide sustained support for only 3 of the 5 TFS by end CY 1967 without drawdown of the CONUS base. All three squadrons would be aircraft from the active force. The major impact associated with this deployment would be the required diversion of F-4 aircraft now programmed for reequipping of PACAF units outside Southeast Asia. This would result in reduction of WESTPAC F-4D squadrons to one by end FY 1969 and no replacements until after FY 2/70. PACAF support of tactical fighter SIOP would be further degraded. Also, all F-4 squadrons in Tactical Air Command would be in a replacement training unit (RTU) role by end FY 1969. Additional attrition losses by FY 2/70 would require a procurement increase of 54 aircraft. The remaining two squadrons could only be satisfied by withholding units from the training base, since Reserve/Guard call-up or Europe withdrawals are not envisioned in this alternative. Such reduction in the training base, would seriously degrade Air Force capabilities to sustain the deployed forces. The reduction could be effected by

~~TOP SECRET~~

941103-69

change to rotation and tour length policies. Should such  
actions be taken, it would be possible to provide the remain-  
ing two squadrons from the training base in August 1967.  
However, in order to determine more specific information  
concerning personnel availability, a postulated execution  
and deployment period would be required upon which a study  
in depth could be accomplished, unit reequipping reevaluated,  
and new policies for tour length and rotation established.  
Additional attrition replacements for these 2 squadrons  
would require increased procurement of 36 aircraft, or a  
total of 90 additional aircraft for this alternative. The  
TRS requirement can be satisfied by providing a composite  
squadron of 12 RF-4 and 6 RF-101 aircraft. The RF-4 ele-  
ment of 12 aircraft can only be provided from a partially  
equipped squadron in Okinawa, would not be available until  
November 1967, and would require an exception to personnel  
tour policy. An appropriate increase must be provided to  
the training base; however, this resource will not be  
available until 4/68. The two TCS can be provided from  
active resources, and increased training base can be pro-  
vided. However, this will reduce tactical airlift avail-  
able to STRICOM. The tactical support units can be pro-  
vided from worldwide resources; however, the 31 O-2 air-  
craft (9 command/support) for the TASS must be procured  
and would become available in February (11), March (11),  
and April (9) 1968, and trained TACP augmentation per-  
sonnel will become available beginning in March 1968, with a  
1 July 1967 decision. All the tactical units concerned are  
currently manned at the worldwide rate of 80-90 percent of  
authorized level. Movement to an area of 100 percent  
manning level and a crew ratio of 1.5 to 1 would cause  
considerable personnel turbulence in units from which  
augmentees are withdrawn and temporary reductions in  
unit efficiency.

941103-70

~~TOP SECRET~~

b. This alternative is logistically supportable; however, immediate action would be required to procure additional war consumables, such as munitions, wing tanks and pylons, to provide sustained support for the additive forces. Lead time for such commodities varies from six to nine months. Initial support in other supply areas can be provided from current stocks (peacetime and WRM); however, replacement procurement would have to be effected immediately to reconstitute such stocks to maintain contingency capabilities. Similar lead times can be expected. An early decision and authority would be required for organizing and equipping a civil engineer heavy repair squadron (RED HORSE) and a civil engineer group headquarters for employment at Nam Phong. Although initial support and austere operating capability can be provided by organic civil engineer personnel and TDY PRIME BEEF augmentation deployed in advance of the tactical units, sustained operations would require upgrading of Nam Phong to main operating base capability. Such construction effort requires the skills and equipage of the RED HORSE unit. Lead time for these units is six months from decision and approval date. Medical support at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base would be degraded until medical personnel could be procured through normal replacement channels. Also, additional manpower spaces would be required to reconstitute units from which augmentees are withdrawn, if the deployment is to be of sustained duration.

5. ~~( )~~ Alternative 2 (3 TFS, 1 TRS, 2 TCS, and Associated Units):

~~TOP SECRET~~

941103-71

a. The problem areas associated with this alternative are identical to those in alternative 1 (paragraph 4 above), except that the impacts are lesser in degree. The reprogramming of 3 F-4 squadron assets from PACAF is still required, and only the last 3 of the 6 scheduled squadrons in PACAF could be equipped. Additional procurement of 54 aircraft is required for projected F-4 attrition losses. The 18 TASS O-2 aircraft (5 command/support) would be available in February and March 1968 from new procurement, and the TACP augmentation would be available in March 1968.

b. This alternative is logistically supportable with additional procurement actions required for war consumable items. Early decision and authority is also required for organizing and equipping a RED HORSE squadron and civil engineer group headquarters for employment at Nam Phong Air Base to provide a sustained operational capability.

6. Alternative 3 (8 TFS, 1 TRS, 2 TCS, and Associated Units):

a. In this alternative, Reserve/Guard call-up is envisioned and would be used. The 9 F-100 ANG units would be called to active duty as 25 UE units. Five squadrons would be reorganized and deployed as five 18 UE squadrons. The other units/aircraft would be required to provide attrition and CONUS sustaining base. The remaining three TFS (active squadrons) deploy as in alternatives 1 and 2, leaving no shortfall in tactical fighter units. Reprogramming, unit conversion, and personnel impacts in alternative 1 also apply, and an increase in procurement for 54 F-4 attrition aircraft is required through FY 2/70. ANG F-100 losses in the same period would reduce the ANG F-100 force to about 5 squadron equivalents at 25 UE.

~~TOP SECRET~~

The major impact in this alternative is the lesser extent 1  
to which augmentation forces could be provided to USCINCEUR 2  
during the period D- to D+30, represented in the reduction 3  
of 9 ANG F-100 units. The total effect of such a 4  
degradation is significant and would require separate 5  
evaluation. The tactical support units can be provided 6  
from worldwide resources; however, the 44 (13 command/support) 7  
0-2 aircraft, new procurement, would become available in 8  
February, March, April, and May 1968 at a rate of 11 each 9  
month. TACP augmentation personnel become available in 10  
March 1968. The two TCS are available as in alternative 1 11  
with the same impact. The TRS can be met in July 1967 through 12  
activation of two ANG RF-84 (BEEFBROTH) units to provide one 13  
deployable 18 UE squadron and one 18 UE squadron for employ- 14  
ment in the RTU role. 15  
b. This alternative is logistically supportable; how- 16  
ever, austere conditions would exist due to extensive air base 17  
saturation. Some loss in operational effectiveness would 18  
be expected, and remedial improvements to existing bases 19  
in SVN would be required. Such actions should be initiated 20  
promptly after decision date to provide additional 21  
expeditionary facilities such as ramp and parking (airfield 22  
matting) and POL augmentation, in addition to upgrading 23  
Nam Phong Air Base as quickly as possible to support 24  
sustained operations. Additional procurement actions, as 25  
in alternatives 1 and 2, are required for war consumable 26  
items. A RED HORSE squadron, in addition to one at Nam Phong, 27  
is required at Da Nang to be employed in elements at bases 28  
in SVN receiving the additive forces. To provide civil 29  
engineer supervision, design, and management, a civil engineer 30  
group should also be deployed to Nam Phong. 31

~~TOP SECRET~~

941103-73

~~SECRET~~

## ANNEX E

### MOVEMENT DATA

1. (U) In preparing the movement schedules, the limiting parameters were the dates of availability for deployment of units, the quantity of transportation, and the capacity of facilities to receive and unload at destination.

2. (S) In alternatives 1 and 2, the units could be moved with few exceptions as they became ready for deployment. The dates for deployment coincide roughly with the availability of transportation. The 82nd Division and those Air Force units available in the first month are moved by air. Significant elements of the Marine forces, which are combat loaded, are moved by Navy amphibious shipping in the first month. MSTs ships are used to carry cargo and some support units also in the first month. The bulk of the remaining combat and support elements are moved by air and MSTs during August and September with a few units and some shortfalls moving in small increments as they become ready over the following several months. In general, the units will maintain integrity and will arrive configured to conduct operations in a minimum of time.

3. (S) In the third alternative, some units will be delayed beyond their readiness dates unless additional commercial shipping could be obtained for a short period. In this alternative also, unit integrity would be generally maintained. Several units would deploy direct from Europe and would marry up with the force in Southeast Asia.

4. (S) The over-all receiving capability of SVN ports is estimated to be approximately 1,550,000 M/tons per month while actual receipts have averaged about 1,350,000 M/tons per month. Thus, there is a capacity to receive approximately

~~SECRET~~

941103-74

~~TOP SECRET~~

200,000 M/tons of additional input if all facilities were used. 1  
The additional maximum input of material for the corps force 2  
amounts to slightly over 200,000 tons in the months of August. 3  
and September. Therefore, no significant increase in port 4  
facilities will be required if disposition of the force is 5  
such that multiple ports may be used for its support. 6

5. ~~(U)~~ The airlift required for these movements consists of 7  
all cargo aircraft that can be made available by cutting other 8  
areas of the world to the approved JCS minimum, plus a continued 9  
15,000 S/T cargo per month to SVN. Passenger airlift required 10  
amounts to about one half of the available worldwide MAC owned 11  
or commercial contracted airlift. This would include sufficient 12  
airlift for replacements for combat losses. All MSTs troop ships 13  
(16) will be required for troop lift, July through October. 14  
Amphibious shipping available elsewhere would be at a minimum 15  
for 60 to 90 days. Detailed numbers of ships and airlift 16  
sorties required are in TABS A, B, and C. 17

6. ~~(U)~~ In alternatives 1 and 2, if shortfalls were to be 18  
overcome by transfers from Europe, this could be accomplished 19  
by diverting troop ships, as required and available, from SVN 20  
to Europe for trooplift plus commercial charter of the necessary 21  
Atlantic cargo ships. 22

~~SECRET~~

941103-75



AIR TRANSPORTED ELEMENTS REQUIRE:  
A total of 82 sorties.

3 troop ships 11 cargo ships

To be moved over a 12 month  
period when available and ready.

AIR TRANSPORTED ELEMENTS REQUIRE:  
A total of 1232 sorties.

NON AIR TRANS CARGO REQUIRE:  
3 cargo ships

AIR TRANSPORTED ELEMENTS REQUIRE:  
A total of 1450 sorties.

NON AIR TRANS CARGO REQUIRE:  
3 cargo ships

AIR TRANSPORTED ELEMENTS REQUIRE:  
A total of 58 sorties.

NON AIR TRANS CARGO REQUIRE:  
2 cargo ships

(AP: Nov 809P, 126 S/T; Jan 475P, 150C S/T  
Feb 159P, 65 S/T)

1 troop ship 4 cargo ships

11 troop ships 23 cargo ships

Available 11 Aug 67 by transfer from  
Europe, etc. - see Feb 68. Requires  
1 troop ship, 5 cargo ships.

Combat div to move by amphib ships.

1 troop ship, 5 cargo ships.

To move via amphib ships.

SECRET

Tab A to Annex E

TAB B TO ANNEX E  
ALTERNATIVE II

FORCE	PM	TIME	MODE	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOVEMBER 67 - NOVEMBER 68	REMARKS
REMAINING ELEMENTS OF 82ND AIRBORNE DIV AIR FORCES (1 SQ)	1925C	20600 S/T	AIR	2	19 Days				AIR TRANS ELEMENTS REQUIRE: A total of 1075 sorties.
NON AIR TRANS CARGO	505	2231 S/T	AIR						NON AIR TRANS CARGO: 3 cargo ships 5 days onloading, 18 days sail time, 7 days offloading.
		21420 M/T	SEA	15	30 Days				
CORPS SUPPORT (USA)	3451	14207 M/T	SEA		30 Days				2 troop ships, 6 cargo ships
CORPS SUPPORT (USA)	3830	16794 M/T	SEA			30 Days			3 troop ships, 7 cargo ships
CORPS SUPPORT (USA)	8446	86980 M/T	SEA						
SUPPORT FORCES FOR 82ND AIR DIV PLUS 4 USAP SQs	10295	27652 S/T	AIR		24 Days				AIR TRANS ELEMENTS REQUIRE: A total of 1045 sorties.
	9446	797 S/T	AIR						
NON AIR TRANS CARGO		20650 M/T	SEA		30 Days				NON AIR TRANS CARGO REQUIRE: 3 cargo ships 5 days onloading, 15 days sail time, 7 days offloading.
SUPPORT FORCES FOR 82ND AIR DIV	14081	8117 S/T	AIR		8 Days				AIR TRANS ELEMENTS REQUIRE: A total of 406 sorties.
NON AIR TRANS CARGO		8000 M/T	SEA		30 Days				NON AIR TRANS CARGO REQUIRE: 1-1/2 cargo ships 5 days onloading, 18 days sail time, 7 days offloading.
REMAINING SUPPORT FOR 82ND AIR DIV AND USAP (1 SQ)	9991 1382	14307 M/T 1693 S/T	SEA AIR						(AF: Nov 800P, 128 S/T, Jan 475P, 1500 S/T; Feb-Mar 90P, 65 S/T.
ARMED CAN BATT	3349	35017 M/T	SEA					26 Days	Available in Aug 67 if transferred from Europe, otherwise will deploy in Feb 68. 1 troop ship, 5 cargo ships.
5TH MAR DIV/3 MAN (-)	37719	134600 M/T	AMPHIB		26 Days				Combat div to move via amphib ships.
SUPPORT, 5TH MAR DIV/3 MAN (-) 10244		142011 M/T	MSTS		30 Days				Support elements to move via MSTS ship. 5 troop ships, 6 cargo ships.
AIR ELEMENTS	286	275 M/T	AMPHIB					26 Days	
2ND MAR DIV/2 MAN (-)	25735	133000 M/T	AMPHIB		45 Days				
SUPPORT 2ND MAR DIV/2 MAN (-) 1183		25140 M/T	MSTS		41 Days				To move via MSTS ships. 1 Troop ship, 4 cargo ships
AIR ELEMENTS	256	259 M/T	AMPHIB					41 Days	

\*Time required to attain C-1 readiness and move to port.  
This chart does not include "UTILITIES".

941103-77

TAB C TO ANNEX E  
ALTERNATIVE III

FORCES	FAK	TUNIS	MODE	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOVEMBER 68	REMARKS
CORPS	519	2573 S/T	AIR	7 4 Days					AIR TRANSPORTED ELEMENTS REQUIRE: A total of 82 sorties.
CORPS SPT	7008	60154 M/T	SEA		30 Days				3 troop ships, 12 cargo ships.
CORPS SPT (FR EUR)	4191	10536 M/T	SEA		26 Days	30 Days			Withdrawn from Europe 1 troop ship, 2 cargo ships.
CORPS SPT	2645	25675 M/T	SEA						1 troop ship, 4 cargo ships.
CORPS SPT (FR EUR)	1179	4788 M/T	SEA			26 Days			Withdrawn from Europe 1 troop ship, 1 cargo ship.
CORPS SPT	4884	40476 M/T	SEA						
To be moved over a 12 month period when available and ready.									
COMBAT ELEMENTS OF 82ND DIV PLUS AIR FORCES (7 TTS)	16096 3225	21800 S/T 3449 S/T	AIR AIR	7 22 Days					AIR TRANSPORTED ELEMENTS REQUIRE: A total of 1110 sorties.
CARGO, NEW AIR TRANS		21420 M/T	SEA	15 30 Days					NEW AIR TRANS CARGO REQUIRE: 3 cargo ships.
ELEMENTS OF 82ND DIV SPT FORCES & AIR FORCES (4 SQ)	10496 5578	20653 S/T 797 S/T	AIR AIR		19 Days				AIR TRANSPORTED ELEMENTS REQUIRE: A total of 1225 sorties.
CARGO, NEW AIR TRANS		20652 M/T	SEA		30 Days				NEW AIR TRANS CARGO REQUIRE: 3 troop ships.
SPT FORCES FOR 82ND DIV WITHDRAWN FROM EUROPE	3490	13960 M/T	SEA		26 Days				1 troop ship, 2 cargo ships.
ELEMENTS OF 82ND DIV SPT FORCES & AIR FORCES SPT	4596 1097	10500 M/T 3065 S/T	SEA AIR						(AF: Jan 4757, 1500 S/T; Feb 4008, 1500 S/T; Mar 2227, 65 S/T)
ARMED CAN REGT	3349	35017 M/T	SEA						Available in Aug 67 by transfer from Europe, otherwise Feb 68. Requires 1 troop ship and 3 cargo ships.
101ST DIV SPT FORCES	2518	12072 M/T	SEA		30 Days				1 troop ship, 2 cargo ships.
101ST DIV SPT FORCES (FR EUR)	6303	49212 M/T	SEA		26 Days				2 troop ships, 7 cargo ships.
101st DIV & SPT FORCES	17312	147737 M/T	SEA			30 Days			9 troop ships, 20 cargo ships.
101ST DIV SPT FORCES (FR EUR)	1162	6248 M/T	SEA			26 Days			1 troop ship, 1 cargo ship.
101ST DIV SPT FORCES	3518	36439 M/T	SEA						
To be moved over a 12 month period as available and ready.									
5TH DIV SPT FORCES	5806	27513 M/T	SEA		30 Days				3 troop ships, 4 cargo ships.
5TH DIV SPT FORCES (FR EUR)	2901	11604 M/T	SEA		26 Days				1 troop ship, 2 cargo ships.
5TH DIV & 5TH DIV SPT FORCES	19110	172620 M/T	SEA			30 Days			9 troop ships, 23 cargo ships.
5TH DIV SPT FORCES (FR EUR)	1748	8942 M/T	SEA			26 Days			1 troop ship, 2 cargo ships.
5TH DIV SPT FORCES	3469	11088 M/T	SEA						
To be moved over a 12 month period as available and ready.									

\*Time required to ready units and move to port.